



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/280,292	03/29/1999	NEIL ROSEMAN	23984-13949	5547

758 7590 02/25/2009
FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER

WEISBERGER, RICHARD C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3693

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/25/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/280,292	Applicant(s) ROSEMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Richard C Weisberger	Art Unit 3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____ .
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-121 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 29-43.60-70 and 71-121 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 44-59 and 71-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____ .
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ . |

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group in Paper No. 14 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that group I is a genus of group II. This is not found persuasive for the reasons of record. The applicant ffff ffff also argues that claims 89-121 should be examined. Claims 89-121 are directed to an apparatus. Previously rejected claims are drawn to a method and serve as a constructive election. Therefore, the requirements are proper and made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 44-59 and 71-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term automatic authentication information is ambiguous. Line 6 of claim 44 states "automatically authenticating the user based on the received automatic authentication information". Authentication is the act proving as authentic (Webster's II New Riverside Dictionary). Thus as claimed, automatic authentication information defies logic. For similar reasons semi-manual authentication is confusing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3624

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

5. Claims 44 and 71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fisher et al., U.S. Patent # 5835896.

Fisher teaches a web based auction method (Figure 4). Fisher's auction method includes a bidding authentication module (Figure 5). As described in column 8 of the specification, a bid is received by bid validator 21 and the customer is looked up at step 41 in customer database 28. If no customer record exists for the customer then a new customer record is created 42 and placed in customer database 28. From there, the bid information is validated 43 as previously described. If the bid data includes one or more errors, then an error message is returned 44 to the bidder, preferably in the form of a well-formatted page posted across the network, itemizing the errors found in the bid. If the bid is valid, as found in step 43, then the bid is placed 46 in bid database 31.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 44-59 and 71-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher et al., US Patent # 5835896 in view of Shambroom, US Patent # 6301661.

Art Unit: 3624

Fisher teaches a web based auction method (Figure 4). Fisher's auction method includes a bidding authentication module (Figure 5). As described in column 8 of the specification, a bid is received by bid validator 21 and the customer is looked up at step 41 in customer database 28. If no customer record exists for the customer then a new customer record is created 42 and placed in customer database 28. From there, the bid information is validated 43 as previously described. If the bid data includes one or more errors, then an error message is returned 44 to the bidder, preferably in the form of a well-formatted page posted across the network, itemizing the errors found in the bid. If the bid is valid, as found in step 43, then the bid is placed 46 in bid database 31.

The reference fails to teach a method wherein the authentication information originates from a cookie stored on a computer of the user. The secondary reference teaches the use of cookies in an authentication method. The claims teach a method for enhanced security for an application using downloadable executable content in a computer network, comprising: providing a client, the client comprising a computer having a web browser and a data character string temporarily stored at the client, the data character string comprising client-authenticating information from a prior login session, the data character string representing a value of a Hypertext Transport Protocol cookie.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time to adopt the cookie into the auction method as motivated by the need to decrease bidding time.

The reference is silent as to the expiration conditions of the manual authentication, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time to have added expiration conditions as motivated by the need to free up space on the server/and or for reasons of security.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 3624

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

/Richard C Weisberger/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3693

Rich Weisberger

Business Methods Examiner

Patents of Banking and Finance

Richard.Weisberger@uspto.gov